	Case 1:20-cv-00279-NONE-SKO Docume	ent 19	Filed 04/22/21	Page 1 of 2
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10				
11	GARETH PERRY,	Cas	se No. 1:20-cv-002	279-SKO (PC)
12	Plaintiff,			CAUSE WHY ACTION
13	v.	FA		DISMISSED FOR IPLY WITH THE
14	UNITED STATES PENITENTIARY, ATWATER,		DAY DEADLINE	3
1516	Defendant.			
17	On March 8, 2021, the Court issued a	ı screenii	ng order directing	Plaintiff to file a second
18	amended complaint or a notice of voluntary dismissal within 21 days. (Doc. 18.) Although more			
19	than the allowed time has passed, Plaintiff has not complied with the screening order.			
20	The Local Rules, corresponding with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, provide,			
21	"[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with any order of the Court may be grounds for			
22	the imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions within the inherent power of the Court."			
23	Local Rule 110. "District courts have inherent power to control their dockets" and, in exercising			
24	that power, may impose sanctions, including dismissal of an action. Thompson v. Housing Auth.,			
25	City of Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based on a			
2627	party's failure to prosecute an action, obey a court order, or comply with local rules. See, e.g.,			
28	Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with a			
20				

court order to amend a complaint); Malone v. U.S. Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130-31 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with a court order); Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to prosecute and to comply with local rules). Accordingly, the Court ORDERS Plaintiff to show cause in writing, within 21 days of the date of service of this order, why this action should not be dismissed for his failure to comply with the Court's order. Alternatively, within that same time, Plaintiff may file a second amended complaint curing the deficiencies identified in the screening order (Doc. 18) or a notice of voluntary dismissal of this case. Failure to comply with this order will result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed for failure to state a claim and to obey court orders. IT IS SO ORDERED. 1st Sheila K. Ober Dated: **April 22, 2021** UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Case 1:20-cv-00279-NONE-SKO Document 19 Filed 04/22/21 Page 2 of 2